



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

torial distribution of the work; that the Secretary publish for the Association this complete revision before the close of the year 1892.

Committee for the revision of the "List of Colleges and of their Modern Language Teachers."

Prof. A. MARSHALL ELLIOTT, Chairman.

- " Henry Johnson, for Maine.
- " Charles B. Wright, for New Hampshire and Vermont.
- " C. H. Grandgent, for Massachusetts.
- " Gustav Gruener, for Connecticut and Rhode Island.
- " D. K. Dodge, for New York and New Jersey.
- " O. B. Super, for Pennsylvania.
- " M. D. Learned, for Maryland and Delaware.
- " J. H. Gore, for the District of Columbia.
- " J. B. Henneman, for Virginia and West Virginia.
- " J. L. Armstrong, for North Carolina.
- " E. S. Joynes, for South Carolina.
- " C. P. Willcox, for Georgia, Alabama, and Florida.
- " C. W. Kent, for Tennessee and Kentucky.

Prof. Alcée Fortier, for Louisiana and Mississippi.

- " R. H. Willis, for Arkansas and Missouri.
- " W. E. Simonds, for Illinois.
- " C. Osthaus, for Indiana.
- " E. A. Eggers, for Ohio.
- " George Hempl, for Michigan.
- " A. H. Tolman, for Wisconsin.
- " G. O. Curme, for Iowa.
- " C. W. Benton, for Minnesota.
- " Morgan Callaway, Jr., for Texas.
- " W. H. Carruth, for Kansas.
- " J. R. Wightman, for Nebraska, North Dakota, and South Dakota.
- " S. Primer, for Colorado, Wyoming, and Montana.
- " H. Schmidt-Wartenberg, for Idaho, and the Territories: Utah, Arizona, and New Mexico.
- " Wm. D. Armes, for California, Nevada, Oregon, and Washington.

The President. The next head of business is the continuation of our program. The paper omitted this morning was that prepared and presented by Mr. BABBITT, on the "Preparation of modern language teachers for American institutions." I take pleasure in presenting to the audience Mr. E. H. BABBITT of Columbia College, New York.

Discussion is open for any one who wants the floor. Is there any discussion on the paper?

Dr. M. D. LEARNED. I should like to say a word or two on one point. I think we in this country are liable to miss our opportunities. I agree with the speaker thoroughly, but it seems to me that he left out of view one very important fact.

Any native American finds, when he goes to Europe, that he has need of all the resources he can command. No student who intends to go abroad should make the mistake of putting off the practical acquisition of the language, so far as conversation and writing are concerned, until he arrives in a foreign land. In all of our larger cities there are ample opportunities for learning German and French, and it ought to be impressed upon both students and teachers, that it is very important that one should make the best use of his opportunities while at home and thus prepare the way for more efficient work while abroad. Where it is possible to create here an atmosphere of

foreign conditions it will not only save a year of study abroad, but will also lessen the expense of the trip by five hundred or a thousand dollars. Then too the student is much more efficient in whatever university study he may pursue in a foreign country.

This is a very important consideration, and I should like to emphasize it.

The President. Is there further discussion on this point?

MR. A. F. CHAMBERLAIN. There is one point to which hardly any attention is devoted by teachers of modern languages, at least in a discussion similar to this. It is often stated that the disciplinary value of modern languages is inferior to that of ancient languages, and consequently, in respect to pedagogical efficiency, modern languages do not rise to that high point attained by the ancient languages. There is one respect in which the modern languages are superior, and one which can be used for pedagogical purposes, and is but little used, and little referred to, and that is, that we have living words in modern languages while in the dead languages they are dead. When we write Greek or Latin we are striving to write it as nearly as we can to what CÆSAR or CICERO, DEMOSTHENES or ARISTOTLE wrote, but when we strive in regard to French or German we go amongst the people; we cease to a certain extent, to be English, and we become French or German. But where is the man in all the days that we have taught Latin and Greek, at least in America, who has become a Latin or a Greek in any similar sense.

I, therefore, maintain that so far as the disciplinary value of modern languages is concerned, as a civilizer, and as an elevator, and from a metaphysical point of view, they are not merely the equals, but the superiors, of the ancient classic tongues.

You learn how English differs from Greek, you learn how it differs from Latin, because you have a catalogue of dead words, but when you deal with French, you meet with certain living forms. You say, "now that looks like our English word; that is almost like our English word; it is spelled like it; my teacher told me there was no difference between the two words. But when I get into France, I find there is a shadow of difference in the meaning of that word, of which I was utterly ignorant."

It is to these differences, I think, the teachers of modern languages should pay just a little more attention than they appear to be doing, if we are to teach modern languages as they should be taught. Prof. EARLE takes the position, that one great argument in favor of the disciplinary value of modern languages is that, while the ancient languages are to a certain extent flexible, their flexibility ceases at a fixed point, but the modern languages are flexible for ever. The French of to-day may not be the French of a hundred years ago, but the Latin of CICERO will ever be the Latin of CICERO, the Greek of ARISTOTLE the Greek of ARISTOTLE.

I think the students and teachers of modern languages have this to

congratulate themselves upon. They have in the ever varying and ever growing modern languages a means of discipline never excelled and possibly never to be excelled. I know that in the University which is my Alma Mater that view seems to be growing more and more, and there is a feeling that modern languages can be utilized in such a way as will relieve them altogether from the aspersions sometimes cast upon them, that they are inferior to the ancient languages, as a means of training the mind, and of inculcating sound principles of thought.

Prof. ALCÉE FORTIER. I desire to call Prof. BABBITT's attention to one point. He said there was no French atmosphere in this country. I should like to invite him to come to New Orleans, to visit our city there, and I think he would find a French atmosphere in every family. In the house, at the fireside, there is a French atmosphere, and if the professor will do me the honor to call at my house I think he will find it so.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I might have extended an invitation to the gentleman to visit Montreal or Quebec, but I forgot that.

Prof. C. SPRAGUE SMITH. I do not agree entirely with Prof. BABBITT in reference to the desirability of not admitting as teachers of modern languages those who are foreign born. It is a rule which admits of exceptions. Some of the most eminent and successful teachers whom I know are foreign born, and among those best qualified to do their work.

My conception of the way in which a language should be taught is to re-create, as far as possible, within the class-room that atmosphere which the individual, who is preparing for his work, will find abroad. It is, of course, a very imperfect re-creation—all re-creations are imperfect—but, in my opinion, that atmosphere should be re-created and from the beginning. Therein the foreign born teachers have an advantage. Where translation is introduced, there should be insistence upon exactness and the rendering of thought with elegance. But I would not lay the chief stress upon translation. I am confident that if an old Latin of the time of CICERO had come into my academic recitation room, seated himself at the desk, heard my recitation and corrected me, that my knowledge of Latin would be much more perfect than it is; for I secured it diluted through English. It was necessarily diluted in passing through English, and similarly the inspiration of Greek literature was diluted by being transmitted through English.

I recall a personal experience illustrating this point. I had read CICERO in the class-room translating, toying with it; but had formed no conception of the beauty of CICERO's style until while living in Italy, I began to read CICERO again. I read it not as a dead, but as a living language. Then for the first time I appreciated the beauty of CICERO.

My own conviction—I am looking at this question in a certain sense as upon a field and an experience that is past—is that the most expeditious, practicable, and profitable method of instruction in modern languages is to re-create, as far as possible, the foreign atmosphere within the recitation room.

But I do not believe that a language can be mastered without building upon the grammar.

MR. BABBITT. The last speaker has put forth ideas which are, perhaps, excellent types of the style of thinking which advocates a method of instruction in our institutions, but which I must regard as impossible. The use of the language from the outset in the class-room requires such a preponderance of personality on the part of the teacher over that of the student, that it has been found impossible, except in the case of geniuses. There may be some foreign born teachers who teach best in that way, and there are some people doubtless who can carry the weight of this kind of instruction, but they are few and far between, and the average teacher is obliged to work on a different basis.

It is a question of how much personal attention a pupil can get from his teacher as to how fast he will progress. A teacher who can get hold of the pupils one at a time and long enough at a time to do them any good, can undoubtedly produce the best results in this way, but the actual state of things does not allow enough of this kind of personal contact to produce practically any effect whatever in most cases; at least not to produce sufficient effect to make itself felt on every member of the class.

If you want to go into arithmetic on this subject, I think Prof. GRANDGENT has published something. You take a class of forty boys with ninety hours a week instruction; to how much does that entitle each one of the personal attention of the teacher?

I maintain that it is impossible to do this in our colleges as they exist. I have no doubt that the most inspiring kind of teacher is the teacher who has the gift of teaching and who is master of the language he is trying to teach, especially when it comes to the higher field. I can see, furthermore, that the higher the field the more valuable the teacher becomes if he is a native to the language which he is attempting to teach. But when you get down to the preparatory school, where boys of fourteen and so on are the subject of instruction, the weight is in favor of the other kind of men.

I will say that the art of speaking a language is a matter, in my judgment, to be given over, as largely as possible, to the field of private instruction.

Prof. C. SPRAGUE SMITH. I beg courteously to disagree with Prof. BABBITT on this point. I may be allowed to quote from a little experience, perhaps, now that I have stepped out of the ranks of teachers.

I had a class in Spanish—a small class—I suppose that the explanation of the result is partially the limitation of the number. I started them first by speaking the language to them, modifying the natural method, calling their attention to certain articles in the room and familiarizing them with the sound of the language. Then I indicated the most important rules of the grammar by dictation in Spanish and required on their part, at the next hour, a recitation of those rules (likewise) in Spanish. Gradually, as they were able to bear it, I read or recited to them extracts from the literature, which I thought would inspire and hold up before them promises of a future, explaining where they could not understand, and gradually leading them forward until after a short time I was able to put the grammar of the language into their hands and they used it as a text book.

At the end of the year of instruction, two hours a week, they had mastered the grammar, knew it thoroughly; they had read a drama of CALDERON, a modern comedy, a poem or two, etc., and not merely this, but they had gained an inspiration and a taste, to use Prof. BABBITT'S words, that I had never been able to give to any other class by employing any other method.

The result of my experience would be that, in as far as possible, one should re-create that atmosphere into which one enters on visiting a foreign country, when one casts aside and forgets in every possible way the native idiom.

Dr. J. W. BRIGHT. The remark was made this morning—I did not hear the whole of the discussion—that students should be brought into the condition of forgetting, as far as possible, the English language. In connection with this paper almost the same opinion has been urged, that a foreign atmosphere should be created for the student. In an important sense it is true that a man knows no language except his own; in the same sense I believe it to be equally true, that no man knows his own language who knows another.

Prof. SMITH'S 'Spanish atmosphere' method appears to me to be but another manner of teaching the practical grammar. But my point is that the teacher of modern foreign languages has to guard against doing violence to the student's vernacular. Under all conditions of linguistic study something should be done to quicken and to enrich the feeling for the native idiom. No class-room method can create a foreign atmosphere, but much can be done to vitiate the purity and destroy the power of the student's best inheritance.

Prof. ALCÉE FORTIER. Dr. BRIGHT'S view seems to indicate that he believed from what I said that we wanted to be Frenchmen in Louisiana. That is not our intention in the least. In speaking of the French atmosphere, I was referring entirely to the language, as I believe we are just as good Americans as Dr. BRIGHT or any one else. Although, as I have often said, we desire to keep the French language in our families we claim that we are Americans, and we want to be so regarded by all men. There is no doubt about that.

As to a plea for English, I think Dr. BRIGHT was referring to a word I said this morning. I wish to disclaim any intention of attacking English. I only wished to say that my colleagues, the professors of English, should take charge of that branch, and not the professors of Modern Languages. I know the great ability of men like Dr. BRIGHT, and I can count upon them to counteract any harm done to the English of my pupils by my desire to teach French by speaking that language in my class.

Prof. R. E. BLACKWELL. I am sure that Mr. SMITH would not try by his method to teach fifty-five pupils, the number that a gentleman from a New England University tells me he has in one class. A man must adapt himself to circumstances, should use methods that he finds produce the most satisfactory results. I should not ask Prof. FORTIER to teach as most of us do. His surroundings are peculiarly favorable, and I know he teaches in a way to make the most of them. His method would not suit us however. If we understood the conditions under which each had to teach, we should less often disagree about methods.

Prof. C. SPRAGUE SMITH. I disagree with Dr. BRIGHT very distinctly and entirely with regard to his position in connection with English. In my opinion the more thoroughly and entirely we master foreign languages, and I would almost say the more of them we master, so as to secure more points of view, the greater our gain when we come back to English. By forgetting, for the time being, English a man can master more readily a foreign idiom.

There has been no more beautiful and exact expression in English, in modern critical English, than JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL has given us. He was a master of many languages. The question of the mastery of a language is, however, a relative question. GEORGE MARSH, our minister to Italy, once asked an American, who had lived six months in Rome, whether he could read Italian without a dictionary.

The question was answered in the negative. It was then suggested that CHARLES SUMNER after a brief stay in Italy, had declared that he could read anything in Italian without a dictionary. Mr. MARSH said:

"I have devoted my whole life to the study of languages and I have not yet reached the point where I can read English without a dictionary."

If Dr. BRIGHT will excuse the comparison, to confine one's self to English, in order not to lose one's mastery of it, is like shutting one's self up as a hermit in order to lead a more perfect life.

The President. The Chair is sorry to announce that on account of the lack of time discussion on this point will have to be suspended. The next paper on the program is by Prof. ALCÉE FORTIER (Tulane University), on "The Isleños of Louisiana and their Dialect."

Prof. ELLIOTT will open the discussion.